

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 21-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0087129) (hereinafter “Miura”) in view of Nishiki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,144) (hereinafter “Nishiki”).

Claims 21-23, 25 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komada (U.S. Patent No. 2001/0038894) (hereinafter “Komada”) in view of Fumihiro (JP 11-335820) (hereinafter “Fumihiro”).

Claims 21-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,246) (hereinafter “Kim”). in view of Smith (WO 01/31081) (hereinafter “Smith”).

Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Nishiki, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of the allegedly “admitted prior art.”

Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Smith, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of the allegedly “admitted prior art.”

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Nishiki, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,743) (hereinafter “Konishi”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komada in view of Fumihiro, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Konishi for substantially the same reasons as applied to claims 26 and 27 above.

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Smith, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Konishi for substantially the same reasons as applied to claims 26 and 27 above.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

In response to the Office Action, Applicants have canceled claim 23 and have further amended claims 21 and 22, to clarify features of the claimed embodiments and/or to improve the form of the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that this relationship is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 21-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0087129) (hereinafter “Miura”) in view of Nishiki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,144) (hereinafter “Nishiki”). Claims 21-23, 25 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komada (U.S. Patent No. 2001/0038894) (hereinafter “Komada”) in view of Fumihiko (JP 11-335820) (hereinafter “Fumihiko”). Claims 21-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,246) (hereinafter “Kim”). in view of Smith (WO 01/31081) (hereinafter “Smith”). Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Nishiki, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of the allegedly “admitted prior art.” Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Smith, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of the

allegedly “admitted prior art.” Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Nishiki, as applied to claim 21, and further in view of Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,743) (hereinafter “Konishi”). Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komada in view of Fumihiko, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Konishi for substantially the same reasons as applied to claims 26 and 27 above. Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Smith, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Konishi for substantially the same reasons as applied to claims 26 and 27 above.

Applicants have canceled claim 23, and have further amended claims 21 and 22, to clarify features of the claimed embodiments and/or to improve the form of the claims. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The embodiment of the present invention as recited in independent claim 21 relates to a method of fabricating a plasma display panel having a substrate and a protection film formed over a display area of the substrate. The protection film is formed of magnesium oxide having a (1,1,1) alignment. The method comprises the steps of: (a) feeding the substrate in a vacuum atmosphere so as to move along a passage extending in a first direction; and (b) depositing the protection film by heating and evaporating a plurality of evaporation sources positioned to face the substrate passing the evaporation sources wherein at least two of the evaporation sources are positioned outside a space to sandwich the space at opposite ends thereof during the deposition step. The space is defined between a pair of flat planes that extend substantially perpendicular to the passage and extends from the opposite edges of the display area of the substrate passing the

evaporation sources, such that an angle between a first line connecting any one of the two evaporations sources and an edge point on the display area closest to said one evaporation source and a second line parallel to a surface of said display area and perpendicular to said first direction is 80 degrees or less. With this arrangement, a protection film having uniform crystal alignment of (1,1,1) can be formed over an entire surface of the display area, thereby improving the characteristics of the protection film, such as second electron emission and resistance against sputtering.

Applicants respectfully submit that Miura and Komada each fails to teach or suggest these features, and newly cited Smith merely discloses a vacuum deposition system to cover a substrate with a deposition material of uniform thickness. Therefore, Smith fails to teach or suggest forming a magnesium oxide film having a (1,1,1) alignment. Similarly, Applicants submit that newly cited Kim merely discloses a method to manufacture a protection film on the plasma display panel and does not teach forming a magnesium oxide film having a (1,1,1) alignment.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious or possible to achieve the embodiment of the present invention even as recited in independent claim 21 in view of the teachings of the cited references, including newly cited Kim and Smith. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 22, 24-27 and 29 are allowable at least because of their dependence from newly-amended independent claim 21, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully request the entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: October 16, 2007

By: 

Joseph J. Buczynski

Reg. No. 35,084

Customer No. 055694
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 230-5114
Fax: (202) 842-8465